

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Office Action Mailing Date: August 18, 2009

Examiner: AHLUWALIA Navneet K.
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655
 Confirmation No.: 9948

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 49 are now amended.

Response to arguments

Examiner argues that paragraphs 100-104 in Zuk disclose the two stage comparison that is claimed by the present application. Applicant, in response, disagrees for the following reasons.

The first search in Zuk looks for protocol identification (for example 821 for SMTP) in the header of the message. Zuk does not change any data into a special form which may be used for improving the search.

By contrast, the present application performs the first search on data that is converted to canonical form in order to perform a fast search. Page 16 lines 5-12 state "In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the information within the digital medium is first pre-processed and transformed into a representation that facilitates fast comparison with the stored information items".

Amended claim 1 of the present invention defines "comparing said information sequence in said format facilitating said relatively fast comparison with said prestored information items in said format facilitating said relatively fast comparison..."

Amended claim 49 of the present invention states: "wherever a match is found using said relatively fast comparison involving canonical representation, then comparing original text to make a second determination of a match..."

The above claimed features are not to be found in Zuk.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Office Action Mailing Date: August 18, 2009

Examiner: AHLUWALIA Navneet K.
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655
 Confirmation No.: 9948

The first search in Zuk looks for the protocol identification (for example 821 for SMTP) in the header of the message, the second search looks for the protocol specification (for example allowable actions for each protocol) in the data base. Thus, Zuk carries out two searches on *completely different data*; the first search is performed on the header and the second search is performed on the data base. Furthermore each search looks for different information. The first search looks for protocol identification while the second search looks for a protocol specification that corresponds to the protocol identified in the first stage. By contrast, the present application as claimed looks for the same information in the same data item in both of the searches. The first search is performed while the data is transferred into a format facilitating fast comparison while the second search is performed while the data is in the original format.

A second difference between the searches is the number of times that the second search is actually performed. Amended claim 1 of the present invention states:

"...when a match is found between said formats facilitating said relatively fast comparison then carrying out a said second relatively slower textual comparison..."
 The first search, of the present application, causes the second search to be needed less often. The second search is performed only when a match is found in the first search, in order to reduce the number of queries to the data base. Page 17 lines 20-23 and page 18 lines 1-2 states "Reference is now made to Fig. 2, which illustrates a system, substantially similar to the one described in Fig. 1, where a fast proof of non-existence module **155** is introduced between the scanner **150** and the comparator **160**. The proof of non-existence module is operable to prove, with a probability **P**, that a certain item does not exist in the list in the storage **130**, thereby significantly reducing the number of queries to the storage **130**."

Amended claim 1 of the present application states "when a match is found between said formats facilitating said relatively fast comparison then carrying out a

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al
 Serial No.: 10/815,764
 Filed: April 2, 2004
 Office Action Mailing Date: August 18, 2009

Examiner: AHLUWALIA Navneet K.
 Group Art Unit: 2166
 Attorney Docket: 27655
 Confirmation No.: 9948

said second relatively slower *textual comparison*". Amended claim 49 states " and wherever a match is found using said relatively fast comparison involving canonical representation, then *comparing original text*". Thus the second search queries the database only when a match is found in the first search. The second search furthermore is carried out *on the text itself* that was the subject of the first search.

By contrast the first search in Zuk is carried out for finding the protocols in a packet while the second search is performed for finding *information regarding the protocols that were found in the first search*. The first search does *not* cause the second search to be needed less often. Thus the skilled person in the art would not know how to use the first search in Zuk in order to improve the searching process by performing the second search less often.

Thus the independent claims are believed to be novel and inventive. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on the main claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
 Registration No. 56,437
 Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: February 2, 2010

Enclosure:

- Petition for Extension (Three Months)